

REMARKS

The Office Action of March 11, 2009 has been received and its contents carefully considered. A Request for Continued Examination under 37 CFR §1.114 is submitted herewith.

Claims 8-14 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 8, 12 and 13 are amended. Claim 8 is independent. Reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action states that claims 12-14 recite allowable subject matter. Applicants note this statement of allowability with satisfaction, and base the above amendments in part on this statement. Specifically, claims 12 and 13 are rewritten in independent form, including all of the features of the claims from which they depend. Here, both claims 12 and 13 are amended to incorporate subject matter recited in previously pending claim 8. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 12 and 13 are allowable, and that claim 14 continues to recite allowable subject matter.

The Office Action rejects claims 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by 6,967,435 to *Park et al.* (hereinafter “*Park*”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,909,081 to *Eida et al.* (hereinafter “*Eida*”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 8 recites, among other features, adhesive that is disposed between and in direct contact with the organic light-emitting device and the color-converting filters, and a stress-relieving layer that is disposed between and in direct contact with the organic light-emitting device and the color-converting filters. These features are shown, by way of example, by elements 7 and 8 in Fig. 1 of the disclosure of this application.

In contrast, *Park* teaches a device including an adhesive film 300, an overcoat layer 250 and asserted by the Office Action to correspond, respectively to an adhesive and a stress-relieving layer, as recited in claim 8. Both the adhesive film 300 and the overcoat layer 250 extend across the device, with the overcoat layer 250 disposed above the adhesive film 300, as shown in Fig. 4 of *Park*. However, the overcoat layer 250 is in direct contact with only a color filter layer 230, and the adhesive film 300 is in direct contact only with a passivation layer 180.

Therefore, *Park* cannot reasonably be considered to teach, or to have suggested, adhesive that is disposed between and in direct contact with the organic light-emitting device and the color-converting filters, and a stress-relieving layer that is disposed between and in direct contact with the organic light-emitting device and the color-converting filters, as recited in claim 8. *Eida* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Park* as discussed above.

In view of the above, no permissible combination of the applied references can reasonably be considered to teach, or to have suggested, the combination of features recited in independent claim 8. Claims 9-11 are also allowable, at least for their dependence on allowable independent claim 8 as discussed above, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejection of the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §103 are respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

May 21, 2009

Date



Allen Wood (Registration No. 28,134)
Customer number 23995
Rabin & Berdo, P.C.
Telephone: (202) 371-8976
Facsimile: (202) 408-0924

AW/ARK/dq/pq